

RECTIFICATIONS FOR BLATCHLEY'S "HETEROPTERA" WITH THE DESCRIPTION OF A NEW SPECIES (HEMIPTERA).

BY HARRY H. KNIGHT, Ames, Iowa.

In a recent number of this journal,¹ Dr. W. S. Blatchley has published an article entitled "Quit-claim specialists vs. the making of manuals." Among sundry items he has made statements concerning the status of certain species of Miridae which require further comment.

Blatchley refers to my paper (*Ent. News*, xxxvii, 1926 (Oct.), pp. 258-262) in which new varieties of *Paracalocoris externus* (H. S.) are described, as "issued Dec. 20, 1926." He is mistaken in this since the October number of *Entomological News* (1926) was issued October 15, 1926. Such being the case Dr. Blatchley is not obliged to assume authorship of these color varieties which he names "spotted-dogs."

Eustictus filicornis (Walker).

- 1873 *Capsus filicornis* Walker, *Cat. Heter.*, vi, p. 96.
1886 *Megacoelum filicornis* Uhler, *Check List*, p. 18.
1887 *Megacoelum grossum* Uhler, *Ent. Amer.*, iii, p. 70.
1904 *Creontiades filicornis* Distant, *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (ser. 7), xiii, p. 106.
1909 *Eustictus grossus* Reuter, *Acta Soc. Sci. Fenn.*, xxxvi, No. 2, p. 35.
1917 *Cimatlan grossum* Van Duzee, *Cat. Hemiptera*, p. 352.
1923 *Eustictus grossus* Knight, *Hem. Conn.*, p. 484.
1926 *Creontiades filicornis* Blatchley, *Het. E. N. Amer.*, p. 733.
1926 *Eustictus grossus* Blatchley, *Het. E. N. Amer.*, p. 884.
1927 *Eustictus filicornis* Knight, *Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc.*, xxii, p. 101.
1928 *Creontiades filicornis* Blatchley, *Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc.*, xxiii, p. 16.
1928 *Eustictus filicornis* Blatchley, *Jl. N. Y. Ent. Soc.*, xxxvi, p. 11.

In commenting on this species I wrote (1927) as follows: "Mr. W. E. China writes me that the type *filicornis* Walk. runs in my keys (Hemiptera of Connecticut) to *Eustictus grossus*

¹ *Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc.*, XXIII, 1928, pp. 10-18.

Uhler. Since this species is such a distinct form there could scarcely be any mistake in placing it in the keys. It is regrettable that Uhler's distinctive name should pass into synonymy but the evidence seems rather conclusive." In referring to this species, Dr. Blatchley (1928, p. 16) asks this question: "If Knight thinks that *flicornis* is 'such a distinct form that there could scarcely be any mistake in placing it in the keys,' why did he not place it in his 'Monograph of *Deraeocoris*' and in the Hemiptera of Connecticut?"

Since the above (1927) was written I have sent a specimen of *grossus* Uhl. to Mr. China at the British Museum for comparison with the type of *flicornis* Walker and he reports that the specimens undoubtedly belong to the same species.

Labops hirtus Knight.

1922 *Labops hirtus* Knight, Can. Ent., liv, p. 258.

1923 *Labops hirtus* Knight, Hem. Conn., p. 501.

1926 †*Labops hesperius* Blatchley, Het. E. N. Amer., p. 797.

1927 *Labops hirtus* Knight, Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc., xxii, p. 101.

1928 †*Labops hesperius* Blatchley, Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc., xxiii, p. 16.

In my last reference to this species (1927), I took space to again point out the differences between *hesperius* Uhl. and *hirtus* Kngt., distinctions which are plainly evident to all students who have compared the two species. I am pleased to say that in September, 1928, Mr. Van Duzee visited with us at Ames, when I had opportunity to have him compare types of *hirtus* Kngt. with specimens of *hesperius* Uhl. that had been compared with the type in the U. S. N. M. Mr. Van Duzee was free to admit that the two species are certainly distinct, and that he evidently did not have the true *hesperius* Uhl. until I sent him specimens.

Barberrella apicalis Knight.

1923 *Barberrella apicalis* Knight, Hem. Connecticut, p. 657.

1926 *Pilophorus brimleyi* Blatchley, Ent. News, xxxvii, p. 165.

1926 *Pilophorus brimleyi*, Blatchley, Het. N. E. Amer., p. 808.

1927 *Barberrella apicalis* Knight, Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc., xxii, p. 102.

1928 *Barberrella brimleyi* Blatchley, Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc., xxiii, p. 17.

1928 *Barberrella brimleyi* Blatchley, Jl. N. Y. Ent. Soc., xxxvi, p. 12.

Through the kindness of Mr. C. S. Brimley, I was able to examine the type of *Pilophorus brimleyi* Blatchley while passing through Raleigh, N. C., in September, 1926. At that time I told Mr. Brimley that the type was the same as my *Barberrella apicalis* or a closely allied form, but I did not wish to commit myself positively until I returned home to examine the type of *apicalis* Kngt. Arriving home I examined the type of *apicalis* and became convinced that *brimleyi* Blat. is identical. Not satisfied with this, Dr. Blatchley (1928) states his opinion that his *brimleyi* remains distinct until the types are compared side by side. Such a comparison was entirely agreeable to me, thus I suggested to Mr. Brimley that we send our types to the U. S. National Museum where various specialists could check the comparison. Mr. Brimley very kindly sent his type for this purpose so we were able to get an "official verdict."

Concerning this comparison of the types, Dr. Harold Morrison wrote as follows: "I have finally gotten through with what I consider to be a critical comparison of your holotype of *Barberrella apicalis* and the type of *Pilophorus brimleyi* Blatchley. As a result of this examination it is my opinion that the two specimens represent the same species." Further: "Mr. McAtee has examined the two specimens and has expressed to me his belief that they represent the same species."

A few days later Dr. C. J. Drake visited Washington and made comparison of the types. He also reported that the type specimens undoubtedly belong to the same species.

Pilophorus strobicola Knight.

1923 †*Pilophorus amoenus* Drake, N. Y. St. Col. For., Tech. Pub. 16 (1922), p. 78, fig. 31.

1923 †*Pilophorus crassipes* Knight, Hem. Connecticut, p. 542.

1926 *Pilophorus strobicola* Knight, Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc., xxi, p. 19.

1926 †*Pilophorus amoenus* Blatchley, Het. N. E. Amer., p. 812, fig. 179.

As yet I have been unable to find that I ever made the mistake of labeling this species as *amoenus* Uhler. In Dr. Drake's collection I find a specimen of this species bearing the label "*Pilophorus amoenus*" but not in the hand of the present writer. I

examined the type of *amoenus* Uhler first in 1915 and have had compared specimens in my collection ever since. In the "Hemiptera of Connecticut" I considered this species to represent *crassipes* Popp., but later, after examining Poppius's type specimens, I found the species to be still undescribed, hence the name *Pilophorus strobicola* Knight (1926).

Dicyphus vestitus Uhler.

- 1895 *Dicyphus vestitus* Uhler, Hem. Colorado, p. 46.
 1917 *Dicyphus vestitus* Van Duzee, Cat. Hemiptera, p. 371.
 1922 *Dicyphus notatus* Parshley, S. Dak. St. College, Tech. Bul. 2, p. 16.
 1926 *Dicyphus notatus* Blatchley, Het. N. E. Amer., p. 909.
 1927 *Dicyphus vestitus* Knight, Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc., xxii, p. 104.
 1928 *Dicyphus vestitus* Walley, Can. Ent., lx, p. 119.

When Mr. Van Duzee visited Ames last fall (1928), we looked over the species of *Dicyphus*, and I am glad to say that we both agree on the identity of *vestitus* Uhl. In his Manual, Dr. Blatchley placed *gracilentus* Parshley as a synonym of *vestitus* Uhler, but I find in checking his description of *vestitus*, it actually applies to *gracilentus* Parsh. Dr. Blatchley states (1928) that he "sent in exchange specimens of what I determined as *D. gracilentus* Parshley to E. P. Van Duzee" who determined the same as *vestitus* Uhler. Is it not possible that Mr. Blatchley actually sent *vestitus* Uhler to Mr. Van Duzee, but under the name of *gracilentus* Parshley?

Dicyphus vestitus Uhler does occur in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, as there are such specimens in my collection. For a key to species of *Dicyphus* which is based on authentic material, see the paper by Mr. G. S. Walley (Can. Ent., lx, 1928, p. 119).

Dicyphus gracilentus Parshley.

- 1923 *Dicyphus gracilentus* Parshley, Ent. News, xxxiv, p. 21.
 1926 †*Dicyphus vestitus* Blatchley, Het. N. E. Amer., p. 910.
 1927 *Dicyphus gracilentus* Knight, Bul. Brook. Ent. Soc., xxii, p. 104.
 1928 *Dicyphus gracilentus* Walley, Can. Ent., lx, p. 119.

I have pointed out above how Dr. Blatchley's description under the name *Dicyphus vestitus* Uhler actually refers to *gracilentus* Parshley. In a previous paper (1927) I pointed out some of the differences between *gracilentus* Parsh. and *vestitus* Uhler which need not be repeated here. For a key to the eastern species of *Dicyphus* see the paper by Walley (1928).

The writer published a key to the species of *Macrolophus* (Ent. News, xxxvii, 1926, pp. 313-316) describing two new species. While this paper was in press the description of *M. tenuicornis* Blatchley appeared, and I expect it may prove to be the same as my *longicornis*. However, Dr. Blatchley describes his *tenuicornis* thus: "joint 1 yellow, the extreme tip and base blackish, more than twice as long as width of vertex." Also: "joint 2, three times as long as 1." These relative lengths, if correct, should separate my *longicornis* from *tenuicornis* Blat. But these discrepancies may arise from the more accurate measurements with a micrometer. In *longicornis* Kngt. antennal segment I (.51 mm.) is scarcely equal to twice the width of vertex, black in color with a suggestion of paler at middle; segment II (1.32 mm.) is only 2.6 times the length of segment I.

Unfortunately, two printers' errors occur in my paper on *Macrolophus*. One error in the key where "not" was left out of the first line was corrected by the editor in the following number of Ent. News. The other I find in the description of antennal segments I and II of *longicornis*. It should read thus: antennal segment I, length .51 mm., black, slightly paler on middle; II, 1.32 mm., pale, apex blackish.

The writer pointed out in an earlier paper (1927) the incomplete and misleading records for specimens redescribed by Dr. Blatchley in his Manual. Accordingly, I made a list of the records from Dr. Blatchley's book which I knew to be material collected and determined by myself, and in a few cases specimens collected by others but determined by me and placed in the Minnesota University collection. I sent a list of 60 species of Miridae, which Dr. Blatchley designates "(Minn. Univ. Coll.)" following the month and day which he cites, to Dr. C. E. Mickel now in charge of the Minnesota collection, with the request that he fill in the missing data just as he finds it on the pin labels. Dr. Mickel very kindly complied with this request thus I present the records as returned to me. The name of the species is given first, after that the month and day as recorded by Dr. Blatchley, and following that in brackets is the data supplied by Dr. Mickel, indicating the collector. Specimens bearing paratype labels are also indicated. Many of these specimens represent first records for the state of Minnesota and as such I wish to have them recorded with complete data.

1. *Psallus piceicola* Knegt. Canby, Minn., June 24 [H. H. Knight].
2. *Psallus parshleyi* Knegt. Hennepin Co., Minn., Aug. 2 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
3. *Psallus morrisoni* Knegt. Cramer, Minn., Aug. 10 [H. H. Knight].
Lake Co., Minn., Aug. 15 [H. H. Knight].
4. *Psallus albicentatus* Knegt. Ithaca, New York, July 26 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
5. *Psallus strobicola* Knegt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., July 14 [H. H. Knight].
6. *Campylomma verbasci* Mey. Le Sueur Co., Minn., Sept. 13 [no collector named].
7. *Chlamydatus pulicarius* (Fall.). Rock City, New York, July 4 [H. H. Knight].
8. *Microsynamma bohemanii* Fall. Honeoye Falls, N. Y., June 27 [H. H. Knight].
9. *Plagiognathus caryae* Knegt. Ithaca, N. Y., June 22 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
10. *Plagiognathus delicatus* Uhl. Batavia, N. Y., June 25 [H. H. Knight].
11. *Plagiognathus chrysanthemi* (Wolff). Ithaca, N. Y., June 30 [no collector].
12. *Plagiognathus punctatipes* Knegt. Ithaca, N. Y., June 27 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
13. *Plagiognathus alboradialis* Knegt. Cranberry Lake, N. Y. [C. J. Drake, paratype].
14. *Plagiognathus laricicola* Knegt. Ithaca, N. Y., June 27 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
15. *Plagiognathus repetitus* Knegt. Whiteface, Mt., N. Y., Aug. 22 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
16. *Microphyllellus tsugae* Knegt. Tompkins Co., N. Y., July 3 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
17. *Microphyllellus nigricornis* Knegt. Ithaca, N. Y., July 7 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
18. *Microphyllellus maculipennis* Knegt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., June 10 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
19. *Macrotylus sex-guttatus* Prov. Cook Co., Minn., Aug. 14 [H. H. Knight].
20. *Eustictus salicicola* Knegt. New Ulm, Minn., June 20 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
St. Paul, Minn., July 18 [H. H. Knight, paratype].

21. *Noctuocoris fumidus* V. D. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., June 25 [W. E. Hoffmann].
22. *Orthotylus modestus* V.D. Batavia, N. Y., July 19 [H. H. Knight].
23. *Orthotylus alni* Kngt. Beaver Bay, Minn., Aug. 20 [H. H. Knight].
24. *Orthotylus serus* V. D. Batavia, N. Y., July 5 [H. H. Knight].
25. *Orthotylus submarginatus* Say. Ithaca, N. Y., July 7 [H. H. Knight].
26. *Orthotylus necopinus* V. D. Fairbault, Minn., June 12 [H. H. Knight].
27. *Orthotylus candidatus* V. D. Two Harbors, Minn., Aug. 9 [H. H. Knight].
28. *Diaphnidia capitata* V. D. Cloquet, Minn., Aug. 1 [A. A. Nichol].
29. *Diaphnidia provancheri* (Burque). St. Anthony Pk., June 18 [H. H. Knight].
30. *Lopidea salicis* Kngt. Ramsey Co., Minn., June 27 [H. H. Knight].
31. *Lopidea cuneata* V. D. Gray Cloud Is., Minn., July 12 [H. H. Knight].
Ramsey Co., Minn., July 20 [H. H. Knight].
32. *Ilnacora divisa* Reut. Ft. Snelling, Minn., July 12 [A. T. Hertig].
33. *Lopidea marginalis* Reut. Willow River, Minn., Aug. 7 [H. H. Knight].
34. *Ceratocapsus incisus* Kngt. Ithaca, N. Y., July 26 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
35. *Ceratocapsus fuscinus* Kngt. Batavia, N. Y., Aug. 10 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
Ramsey Co., Minn., July 11 [H. H. Knight].
36. *Ceratocapsus nigrocephalus* Kngt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., July 5-6 [H. H. Knight].
37. *Pilophorus juniperi* Kngt. Gray Cloud Is., Minn., July 20 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
38. *Pilophorus uhleri* Kngt. Batavia, N. Y., July 14 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
Olivia, Minn., June 28 [H. H. Knight, autotype].
39. *Xenoborus pettiti* Reut. Ramsey Co., Minn., June 15 [H. H. Knight].

40. *Xenoborus plagifer* Reut. Carlton Co., Minn., Aug. 18 [H. H. Knight].
41. *Neoborus rufusculus* Kngt. Lakeland, Minn., June 14 [H. H. Knight].
42. *Neoborus glaber* Kngt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., June 6 [H. H. Knight].
43. *Lygus alni* Kngt. Beaver Bay, Minn., Aug. 20 [H. H. Knight].
44. *Lygus approximatus* Stål. Whiteface Mt., N. Y., Aug. 22 [H. H. Knight].
45. *Lopidea lathyri* Kngt. Anoka Co., Minn., July 6 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
46. *Platylygus luridus* Reut. Ithaca, N. Y., July 13 [H. H. Knight].
47. *Lygidea obscura* Reut. Honeoye Falls, N. Y., June 27 [H. H. Knight].
48. *Lygidea viburni* Kngt. Batavia, N. Y., June 24 [H. H. Knight, paratype].
49. *Dichroscytus viridicans* Kngt. New Ulm, Minn., June 20 [H. H. Knight].
50. *Phytocoris depictus* Kngt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., Aug. 11. [There is a series of specimens (paratypes) of this date, collector H. H. Knight; there is also one specimen of this date, no collector label. I do not know which one I sent.]
51. *Phytocoris erectus* V. D. Norman Co., Minn., July 17 [A. A. Nichol].
52. *Phytocoris spicatus* Kngt. Norman Co., Minn., June 25 [A. A. Nichol].
53. *Phytocoris pinicola* Kngt. Ithaca, N. Y., July 11 [H. H. Knight].
54. *Phytocoris diversus* Kngt. Carlton Co., Minn., Aug. 18 [H. H. Knight].
55. *Phytocoris sulcatus* Kngt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., Aug. 5 [H. H. Knight].
56. *Phytocoris corricevicens* Kngt. Ramsey Co., Minn., June 2 [no such specimen in our collection].
57. *Phytocoris conspurcatus* Kngt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., Aug. 5 [H. H. Knight].
58. *Paracalocoris heidemanni* Reut. LeRoy, Alabama, June 12 [H. H. Knight].

59. *Platytyrellus borealis* Kngt. Morrison Co., Minn., July 10
[A. A. Nichol].
60. *Platytyrellus rubellicollis* Kngt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn.,
June 2. [There are specimens dated July 2 and
June 21, both collected (H. H. Knight), but no
specimen of June 2 in our collection.]

A good many species credited to Mr. Gerhard in Blatchley's Manual were collected, named and presented to Mr. Gerhard by myself. Accordingly, I made up a list of 21 species and sent to Mr. Gerhard with request for complete record of data on the labels. Mr. Gerhard very kindly complied with this request, thus I present the data in brackets.

1. *Phytocoris fulvus* Kngt. Wanakena, N. Y., Aug. 1-7 [Col.
by C. J. Drake, det. by H. H. Knight; paratype].
2. *Lygus belfragii* Reut. Batavia, N. Y., July 31 [H. H.
Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 2 paratypes].
3. *Lygus tiliae* Kngt. Portage, N. Y., June 27 [Col. H. H.
Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 2 paratypes].
4. *Lygus viburni* Kngt. Batavia, N. Y., June 15 [Col. H. H.
Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 2 paratypes].
5. *Lygus atritylus* Kngt. Wanakena, N. Y., July 15 [Col. C. J.
Drake, det. H. H. Knight].
6. *Lygus ostryae* Kngt. Portage, N. Y., June 27 [Col. H. H.
Knight, det. H. H. Knight; paratype].
Parry Sound, Ont., Aug. 7 [Col. H. S. Parish, det. H.
H. Knight; paratype].
7. *Lygus geneseensis* Kngt. Portage, N. Y., June 22 [Col. H.
H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; paratype].
8. *Lygus johnsoni* Kngt. McLean, N. Y., July 27 [Col. H. H.
Knight, det. H. H. Knight; paratype].
Ithaca, N. Y., June 20 [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H.
Knight; compared with type].
9. *Lygus communis* Kngt. Batavia, N. Y., Aug. — [Col. H.
H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 4 paratypes].
10. *Lygus univittatus* Kngt. Ithaca, N. Y., June 23 [Col. H. H.
Knight, det. H. H. Knight; compared with type].
11. *Lygus laurae* Kngt. Rock City, N. Y., July 4 [Col. H. H.
Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 2 paratypes].
12. *Lopidea lathyri* Kngt. Anoka Co., Minn., July 6 [Col. H. H.
Knight, det. H. H. Knight; paratype].

13. *Lopidea amorphae* Kngt. Ramsey Co., Minn., July 8, 18 [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; paratype].
14. *Orthotylus knighti* V. D. Attica, N. Y., July 6 [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; compared with type].
15. *Orthotylus ornatus* V. D. Honeoye Falls, N. Y., June 27 [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; compared with type].
16. *Deraeocoris betulae* Kngt. Ithaca, N. Y., July 2 [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 2 paratypes].
17. *Deraeocoris alnicola* Kngt. McLean Bogs, Tompkins Co., N. Y., July 3 [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 2 paratypes].
18. *Deraeocoris aphidiphagus* Kngt. Twin Lake, Minn., July 3 (June 29) [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; paratype].
19. *Deraeocoris nitenatus* Kngt. St. Anthony Pk., Minn., Aug. 5 [Col. H. H. Knight; compared with type].
20. *Deraeocoris laricicola* Kngt. Ithaca, N. Y., June 27 [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 2 paratypes].
21. *Deraeocoris pinicola* Kngt. Ithaca, N. Y., July 13 [Col. H. H. Knight, det. H. H. Knight; 2 paratypes].

A synonym occurs in the paper published by Dr. Blatchley (*Ent. News*, xxxvii, 1926, pp. 163-169), in which he describes six species of Miridae. Three of these are synonyms and now *Sixeonotus albicornis* Blat. is shown to be identical with *Sixeonotus insignis* Reuter (1876). For some time I have been convinced that a southern species of *Sixeonotus* which I have from Texas, Mississippi, and Florida, represents *insignis* Reut. described from Texas in 1876, while the more northern species from Maryland, District of Columbia, and North Carolina which Reuter (1909) determined as his *insignis*, is in fact an unnamed species.

During the past year I have been favored with the much appreciated services of Dr. H. B. Hungerford in making some comparisons with Reuter's types of 1876 which are still preserved in the National Museum at Stockholm. The essential facts concerning the comparison of specimens with the type of *Sixeonotus insignis* Reuter, I quote from Dr. Hungerford's letter as follows: "*Sixeonotus insignis* Reut., 7 specimens, 3 ♂, 3 ♀, and one pasted so I can not tell; a ♂ is marked type and each specimen bears the

two labels: 'Texas,' 'Belfrage.' At London, using Blatchley's book, we had determined the Florida specimens to be *Sixeonotus albicornis* Blatch. and the N. C. specimens as *S. insignis* Reut., and so reported to you. In comparing these two species of yours I find that *S. insignis* Reuter is like the Florida specimens. Therefore what China and I reported to you as *S. albicornis* Blatch. is Reuter's *S. insignis*, and the N. C. species is something else. After I had come to this conclusion I noticed that I could see the claspers in one of the type specimens, and then relaxed and brought to view the claspers in your insects which confirmed my decision. So there you are!"

The results of this comparison are very interesting in view of the fact that I sent Dr. Hungerford two species of *Sixeonotus* without indicating any names, and merely asked him to compare the specimens with the type of *Sixeonotus insignis* Reuter (1876) and let me know if any of my specimens proved identical. Dr. Hungerford's findings agree exactly with the conclusions I had reached after a study of original descriptions and the known distribution of the species concerned. A description of the unnamed species follows:

***Sixeonotus recurvatus* n. sp.**

Allied to *insignis* Reut., but distinguished by structure of the genital claspers, larger and broader form, and by the longer and more prominent pubescence on the hemelytra.

♂. Length 3.6 mm., width 1.8 mm. Head: width .72 mm., vertex .47 mm. Rostrum, length .83 mm., reaching to near hind margin of sternum, pale. Antennae: segment I, length .32 mm.; II, .65 mm., III, .56 mm.; IV, .74 mm.; pale, last two segments becoming fuscous. Pronotum: length .98 mm., width at base 1.5 mm.; basal margin strongly sinuate on middle, covering base of scutellum; disk more strongly inflated and coarsely punctate, and lateral margins more concavely angulated than in *insignis*.

Black, shining, hemelytra only slightly shining; legs, rostrum, and ostiolar peritreme, tips of tarsi and the claws fuscous, lora and sutures of jugs somewhat pale. Membrane and veins black, apical half beyond the veins, pale. Clothed with rather prominent pale pubescence, distinctly longer and more erect on hemelytra than in *insignis*. Genital characters distinctive; left clasper with the slender distal arm recurved away from the triangular base.

♀. Length 3.2 mm., width 1.7 mm. Head: width .74 mm., vertex .49 mm. Antennae: segment I, length .27 mm.; II,

.56 mm.; III, .49 mm.; IV, .72 mm. Pronotum: length .87 mm., width at base 1.4 mm. Very similar to the male in coloration, pubescence and puncturation.

Holotype: ♂, July 12, 1926, Washington, D. C. (H. H. Knight); author's collection. *Allotype*: same data as the type. *Paratype*: ♂, taken with the type on Pale Indian Plantain (*Calcia atriplicifolia*). ♂ ♀, June 8, 1905, Plummer's Island, Md. (O. Heidemann). 12 ♂ ♀, June 15 to July 13, 1912, Black Mountains, N. C. (Beutenmuller).

The generic name *Sixeonotus* Reuter is misspelled in all cases in the Manual as well as in a previous article (Ent. News, 1926, pp. 167-168).

Blatchley's description of *Paracalocoris heidemannii* is based on specimens which I collected at LeRoy, Alabama, June 12, 1917, and left determined in the Minnesota University collection as *heidemannii* Reut. Since that time I have found the Alabama specimens represent another species and therefore described the same as *Paracalocoris breviatus* Knight (Ann. Ent. Soc. Am., xix, 1926, p. 372).

An Early Cerambycid.—On March 10, 1929, while walking home about noon on the main street of Framingham a specimen of *Hylotrupes ligneus* Fab. alighted on my vest. The temperature in the shade was at 62 degrees F. I have never before taken this orange-colored form in this locality but I have a specimen from Worcester, Mass., taken April 20, 1915, one from Malcolm, Neb., dated May 12, 1909, and one from "3-Rivieres, Can.," dated April 13, 1916. A specimen from the same place and with the same date as the last mentioned answers very well to the description of *H. nicolas* White as given by Casey in his 1912 Memoir on page 274. Two other specimens of this genus were taken here in wash-up on May 14, 1909, and May 3, 1912; they are entirely brownish-black and until a careful study of the genus is made it is useless to attempt to place them specifically. I use the old generic name *Hylotrupes* in preference to making annual changes in my labels in trying to follow taxonomic flip-flops.—C. A. FROST, Framingham, Mass.